Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-54 were originally submitted.

No claims are added.

Claim 32 is canceled.

Claims 7, 29, 37 and 47 are currently amended.

Claims 1-31, and 33-54 are pending.

Claim Objection

Claim 7 is objected to because as originally presented claim 7 is dependent upon itself. Claim 7 has been amended to correct this typographical error. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-10, 15, 16, 18-20, 29-34, 36-40, 42, 47-49, 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,487,663 B1 to Jaisimha et al (Jaisimha). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Jaisimha describes methods to regulate ways a user can access media objects. The media file to be transmitted is encoded with an access code. The code bits within the access code indicate the methods through which the media file may be transmitted over the network. The media file is initially stored in a media storage that is accessible by a media server connected to a network. (Jaisimha, col. 2, lines 33-37) This media file is then requested through a media player connected to the network. The request specifies an intended transmission protocol to be used in transmitting the media file. While transmitting, the access code of the media file is first transferred to the media player. The media player then checks whether

the intended transmission protocol is one of the permitted transmission protocols specified by the access code. (Jaisimha, col. 2, lines 38-49).

Fig. 5 of Jaisimha shows a web server communicating with media server and connected to the Internet. The media server is further connected to a media storage (Jaisimha, col. 8, lines 15-25). A web browser is further connected to the Internet that communicates with a media player (e.g., a real player). (Jaisimha, col. 8, lines 28-30) The media player sends a request to the media server to access a media file. In response to the request, the media server sends an encoded header to the media player which then decodes the header file and checks for the permitted types of access.

Fig. 7 shows a typical procedure for encoding a media file. Initially the user starts a media file encoder program that displays an option menu listing the types of access for the media file. The options include: stream, stream and record while streaming, faster than real time reliable download (FTRRD), simultaneous stream and FTRRD and record while streaming etc. The user selects one of these options from the options menu. (Jaisimha, col. 9, lines 14-23). In the next step, the media file encoder calculates an access code corresponding to the selected option. (Jaisimha, col. 9, lines 24-26). The encoder then generates a 32-bit field using the access code. This 32-bit field is then encrypted using a private key protocol such as DES (digital encryption standard). After this, the encrypted 32-bit field is added to an additional randomly generated 96-bit field to generate a 128-bit field. This 128-bit field is then added to the header of the media file. (Jaisimha, col. 9, lines 37-45)

At the user end, when the media player receives the file it checks the status of user selectable record option. If user has selected the record button then the media player will again check the access codes of the file to identify whether the file has enabled recording access. If the access code corresponds to the recording option, then the media player starts storing the media data on a local storage during its transmission. Otherwise (the case when the access code does not

correspond to recording), the media data is not recorded while streaming. (Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 20-35)

Independent claim 1, for example, recites "[a] method comprising:

receiving multimedia content from a source;

creating a linked set of components to process the multimedia content;

determining authority to record the multimedia content;

providing a recording component in the linked set of components to record the multimedia content if authorized to record the multimedia content; and

rendering the multimedia content with use of the linked set of components."

The Action argues that Jaisimha discloses the element "creating a linked set of components to process the multimedia content" as recited by claim 1, citing col. 8, lines 28-30, and Col. 9, lines 16-23. Jaisimha does not disclose such an element. The cited section shows that "A web browser 504 is communicated is connected to the Internet 204. The web browser 504 communicates with a media player 506, such as, for example, RealPlayer by RealNetworks, Inc." (Jaisimha, col. 8, lines 28-30). "The options include include: stream, stream and record while streaming, faster than real time reliable download (FTRRD), simultaneous stream and FTRRD and record while streaming, and simultaneous stream and FTRRD. In one embodiment, the menu is implemented as a pull-down list box. In the step 702, the user selects one of the options from the option menu." (Jaisimha, col. 8, lines 28-30). There is no description in this section or anywhere in Jaisimha as to

the recited element of "creating a linked set of components to process the multimedia content".

The Application discloses methods for providing a recording functionality within a media player wherein the media player creates a filter graph each time it receives a multimedia content. In effect, the media player creates a linked set of components. The linked set includes a multimedia content separator that separates the input multimedia content into audio and video contents. The audio and video contents are then decompressed separately by audio and video decompressors and then further recorded by the audio and the video recording engines. The audio and video recording engines respectively use the audio and video writers to record the contents into a hard disk. (See application, Fig. 2 and page 7).

Accordingly, Jaisimha fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim 1, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-10, 15, 16 and 18-20 depend on claim 1, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 2-10, 15, 16 and 18-20 be withdrawn based on the reasons provided in support of claim 1. Furthermore, particular dependent claims are allowable based on additional reasons provided below.

Claim 7 further recites "[t]he method of claim 1 wherein the linked set of components is destroyed once rendering is complete." The Action presents that "the user can close the RealPlayer once the rendering is complete"; however, there is no disclosure or showing, as discussed above, as to a linked set of components.

Furthermore, the RealPlayer as disclosed in Jaisimha is not destroyed but still available.

Claim 15 further recites "[t]he method of claim 1 wherein the providing is based on the recording component being registered to be installed in the linked set of components." The Action presents that "since the Recording component comes with RealPlayer, it is registered to be installed in the link set of components, col. 13, lines 19-28"; however, as discussed above, there is no disclosure or showing, as discussed above, as to a linked set of components or is there a disclosure or showing as to registration.

Claim 18 further recites "[t]he method of claim 16 wherein the user interface component is part of a media player that comprises the linked set of components." The Action cites col. 13, lines 22-25 of Jaisimha as disclosing this element; however, as discussed above, there is no disclosure or showing, as discussed above, as to a linked set of components, and particularly no disclosure or showing as to "user interface component is part of a media player that comprises the linked set of components" as recited by claim 18.

Independent claim 29 recites "[a] computer comprising:

means for receiving streaming multimedia content;

means for rendering the streaming multimedia content, by creating a linked set of components;

means for storing the streaming multimedia content if so authorized; and

means for playing back the stored multimedia content."

Claim 29 has been amended to include the element of "creating a linked set of components" as recited in claim 32. As discussed above, Jaisimha fails to disclose or show "a linked set of components". The Action particularly rejects claim 32 citing Jaisimha, col. 10, lines 24-32, which states "a next step 610, the web browser 504 is configured to communicate with the media player 506 as a helper application or plug-in. In particular, the media player 506 is associated with the MIME type RM. Thus, when the web browser 504 detects a URL specifying a file of MIME type RM (e.g., the file has an extension ".RM"), the web browser 504 launches the media player 506, if it is not already running, and passes the specified URL to the media player 506 as a parameter." This section, and Jaisimha in general, fails to disclose or show "creating a linked set of components" as recited by claim 29.

Accordingly, Jaisimha fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim 29, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 30, 31, 33, 34 and 36 depend on claim 29, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 29. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 30, 31, 33, 34 and 36 be withdrawn based on the reasons provided in support of claim 29.

Independent claim 37 recites "[a] computer comprising:

a memory;

a processor coupled to the memory; and

instructions stored in the memory and executable on the processor to access streaming multimedia content from a source, render the streaming

multimedia content by creating a linked set of components, initiate a recording component to record the multimedia content if the computer is so authorized, and store multimedia content to a local storage device."

Claim 37 has been amended to include the element "render the streaming multimedia content by creating a linked set of components" and benefits from arguments provided above, as to Jaisimha's failure to disclose or show "creating a linked set of components".

Accordingly, Jaisimha fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim 37, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 37 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 38, 39, 40 and 42 depend on claim 37, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 37. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 38, 39, 40 and 42 be withdrawn based on the reasons provided in support of claim 37.

Independent claim 47 recites "[a] system comprising:

a server computer; and

a playback computer configured to receive multimedia content from the server computer, render the multimedia content by creating a linked set of components, and write the multimedia content to a storage device if so authorized."

Claim 47 has been amended to include the element "render the streaming multimedia content by creating a linked set of components" and benefits from arguments provided above, as to Jaisimha's failure to disclose or show "creating a linked set of components".

Accordingly, Jaisimha fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim 47, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 47 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 48, 49, and 50-54 depend on claim 47, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 47. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 48, 49, and 50-54 be withdrawn based on the reasons provided in support of claim 47.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11-14, 21, 23-28, 35, 41, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaisimha in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,744,975 B1 to Kimura (Kimura). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claims 11-14 depend on claim 1, and include all the elements of claim 1. Jaisimha, as discussed above in support of claim 1, fails to teach or suggest the element "creating a linked set of components to process the multimedia content". Kimura is cited by the Action as to a local storage device; however, Kimura is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Kimura fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claims 11-14, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 11-14 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 21 recites "[a] method comprising:

receiving a stream of multimedia content from a source;

separating the streamed multimedia content into audio content and video content;

initiating a first linked set of components to process the audio content, and a second linked set of components to process the video content;

creating a first recording component in the first linked set of components to record the audio content if authorized, and a second recording component in the second linked set of components to record video content if authorized; and

providing audio output from the first linked set of components and video output from the second linked set of components.

As discussed above, Jaisimha fails to teach or suggest a "linked set of components". Claim 21 recites elements directed to "a first set of linked components" and "second set of link components", which are not taught or suggested by either Jaisimha or Kimura. Kimura is cited by the Action as to "separating the streamed multimedia content into audio content and video content"; however, Kimura is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Kimura fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 21, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 23-28 depend on claim 21, and are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 23-28 be withdrawn based on the reasons provided in support of claim 21.

Dependent claim 35 depends on claim 29, and includes all the elements of claim 29. Jaisimha, as discussed above in support of claim 29, fails to teach or suggest the element "creating a linked set of components". Kimura is cited by the Action as to a writer component; however, Kimura is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Kimura fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 35, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 41 depends on claim 37, and includes all the elements of claim 37. Jaisimha, as discussed above in support of claim 37, fails to teach or suggest the element "render the streaming multimedia content by creating a linked set of components". Kimura is cited by the Action as to a rendering audio conent and video content; however, Kimura is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Kimura fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 41, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 41 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 44 recites "[a] computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

contacting a server computer to send multimedia content;

receiving the multimedia content;

separating the multimedia content into audio content and video content;

decompressing the audio content and video content;

creating an instance of a recording component to record the decompressed audio content and video content if so authorized to record;

rendering to audio output the decompressed audio content and to video output the decompressed video content; and

destroying the instance of the recording component after the multimedia content is rendered.

The Action presents that the element "destroying the instance of the recording component after the multimedia content is rendered" is taught by Jaisimha, because "the user can close the RealPlayer once the rendering is complete". As discussed above, the RealPlayer is just stopped, not destroyed. In other words, the RealPlayer is still available for use. Kimura is cited for its teaching of processing of audio and video; however, Kimura is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Kimura fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 44, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 44 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 45 depends on claim 44, and is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on base claim 45. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 45 be withdrawn based on the reasons provided in support of claim 44.

Claims 17 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaisimha in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0094191 A1 to Horie et al (Horie). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 17 depends on claim 1, and includes all the elements of claim 1. Jaisimha, as discussed above in support of claim 1, fails to teach or suggest the element "creating a linked set of components to process the multimedia content". Horie is cited by the Action as to a user interface; however, Horie is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Horie fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 17, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 43 depends on claim 37, and includes all the elements of claim 37. Jaisimha, as discussed above in support of claim 37, fails to teach or suggest the element "render the streaming multimedia content by creating a linked set of components". Horie is cited by the Action as to a user interface; however, Horie is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Horie fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 43, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 43 be withdrawn.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaisimha in view of Kimura, and in further view of Horie. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 46 depends on claim 44, and includes all the elements of claim 44. Jaisimha, as discussed above in support of claim 44, fails to teach or suggest the element "destroying the instance of the recording component after the multimedia content is rendered". Horie is cited by the Action as to a user interface; however, Horie is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha and Kimura.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Kimura, and in further view of Horie fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 46, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 46 be withdrawn.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaisimha in view of Kimura, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,553 B1 to Hazra (Hazra). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 22 depends on claim 21, and includes all the elements of claim 21. Jaisimha, as discussed above in support of claim 21, fails to teach or suggest the element "linked set of components". Hazra is cited by the Action as to receiving media streams; however, Hazra is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Jaisimha and Kimura.

Accordingly, Jaisimha in view of Kimura, and in further view of Hazra fails to teach or suggest each recited element of claim 22, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All pending 1-31, and 33-54 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: <u>January 10, 2008</u>   By: <u>/Emmanuel A. Rivera/</u>
                                          Emmanuel A. Rivera
                                          Reg. No. 45,760
                                          (509) 324-9256 ext. 245